

REMARKS

The Official Action dated December 17, 2007 has been carefully considered. Accordingly, the changes presented herewith, taken with the following remarks, are believed sufficient to place the present application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

By the present Amendment, claims 1, 4-6, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 23-25, 27, 28, 31-34, and 38 have been amended. Claims 2, 3, 12, 13, 16, 19, 21, 22, 29, 30, 44 and 45 have been canceled. Support for the Amendment may be found in the canceled claims, as well as paragraphs [0020], [0024], [0026], [0027] and [0030]. Since these changes do not involve any introduction of new matter, entry is believed to be in order and is respectfully requested.

In the Official Action, claim 6, 15, 24, 34, 42 and any other similarly worded claims were objected to because of informalities. The referenced claims have been amended as follows: "Error bit comprises . . . horizontal parity code, or vertical parity code." Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §102 - Claims 1, 4, 10, and 20

In the Official Action, claims 1, 4, 10 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Skene et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,616,260) ("Skene"). Regarding claim 1, the Examiner asserted that Skene discloses a communication between a print head and a controller which reads on claimed print host, print host coupled to a print head, communicating a first data stream between the printer host and the print head. Skene discloses, according to the Examiner, setting parity bits and data that are to be communicated in order to detect possible errors, which reads on claimed inserting a reference data stream into the first data stream. The Examiner also

asserted that Skene discloses checking the parity bit that was included in the data stream to check whether or not the data has an error, which reads on claimed validating the first data stream based on the referenced data stream.

Regarding claim 20, the Examiner asserted that Skene discloses communication between an inkjet print head and a controller, which reads on claimed host, print head communication link coupling the print head and the host, and configured to communicate a first data stream between the print head and the host. The Examiner further asserted that Skene discloses setting parity bits, which reads on claimed insert a reference data stream, and data that are to be communicated, which reads on claimed first data string in order to detect possible errors. According to the Examiner, Skene discloses memory integrated with the inkjet print head assembly, which reads on claimed data stream registered coupled with the print head. The Examiner further asserted that Skene discloses the controller checking the parity bit that was included in the data stream to check whether or not the data has an error, which according to the Examiner reads on claimed data validating controller coupled to the host, and configured to validate the first data stream based on the first data stream.

However, as will be set forth in detail below, it is submitted that the methods and a error detection systems as defined by claims 1, 4, 10 and 20 are not anticipated by Skene. Accordingly, this rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

As defined by presently amended claim 1, the present invention is directed to a method of error detection in an inkjet printing apparatus having a printer host coupled to a print head, the method comprising the acts of: synchronously communicating a first serial data stream between the printer host and the print head; inserting a reference data stream into the first serial data stream; and validating the first serial data stream based on the reference data stream.

As defined by presently amended claim 20, the present invention is directed to a data error detection system on an inkjet print head coupled to a host, the data error detection system comprising: a clocking control signal generated by the host; a print head communication link coupling the print head and the host, and configured to communicate a first serial data stream between the print head and the host, wherein the first serial data stream is synchronously sequenced at a frequency of the clocking control signal; a data stream register coupled to the print head, and configured to insert a reference data stream into the first serial data stream at a reference location; and a data validating controller coupled to the host, and configured to validate the first serial data stream based on the reference data stream.

Skene discloses a system and method for detecting an error in data that is received by reading a plurality of conductive lines, with each conductive line associated with a bit (Abstract). However, Skene does not teach, disclose or suggest synchronous serial communication of a first serial data stream.

To anticipate, every element and limitation of the claimed invention must be found in a single prior art reference, arranged as in the claim. *Karsten Mfg. Corp. v. Cleveland Golf Co.* , 242 F.3d 1376, 1383, 58 U.S.P.Q.2d 1286, 1291 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Scripps Clinic & Research Foundation v. Genentech, Inc.*, 927 F.2d 1565, 1576, 18 U.S.P.Q.2d 1001, 1010 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Further, the reference must describe the Applicant's claimed invention sufficiently to place a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention in possession of it. *Akzo N.V. v. United States Int'l Trade Comm'n* , 808 F.2d 1471, 1479, 1 U.S.P.Q.2d 1241, 1245 (Fed. Cir. 1986), *cert denied* , 482 U.S. 909 (1987); *In re Coker*, 463 F.2d 1344, 1348, 175 U.S.P.Q. 26, 29 (CCPA 1972). Skene fails to teach, disclose or suggest a method of error detection in an inkjet printing apparatus comprising, *inter alia*, a first serial data stream that is synchronously communicated at

between a print host or a print head. Skene further does not teach, disclose or suggest a clocking control signal generated by the host. As seen in Fig. 2, the plurality of conductive or bit lines 20A do not synchronously communicate a first serial data stream via serial communication. These address lines are read directly, without synchronous serial communication. Fig. 4A and 4B depicts how the address lines are read through the use of transistors (col. 5, lines 51-61). A data item or word, as disclosed by Skene, is not the same as data stream. Additionally, the parity bits (310C, 310I Fig. 3) are physically located within an address line that is more susceptible to ink shorts or corrosion (col. 7, lines 41-53) and not a reference data stream inserted into the first data stream at a reference location. Whereby, Skene does not anticipate the present invention.

It is therefore submitted that the presently claimed methods error detection systems are not anticipated by Skene, whereby the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 has been overcome. Because claims 4 and 10 correspond to the patentable claim 1, the Applicant respectfully submit that these claims are in a condition for allowance based on the arguments and remarks above. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §103 - Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 11-16, 19, 21-24, 28-30 and 32-35

In the Official Action, claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 11-16, 19, 21-24, 28-30 and 32-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skene in view of Hepworth et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 3,975,912 (“Hepworth”).

Regarding claim 11, the Examiner asserted that Skene discloses communication between an inkjet print head and a controller, which reads on claimed inkjet printing apparatus having a printer hose coupled to a print head. According to the Examiner, Skene discloses setting and checking parity bits and data that have to be communicated in order to detect possible errors,

which reads on claims searching for a validating stream from the received data stream and validating the received data stream when validating data stream comprises a valid data stream, according to the Examiner.

The Examiner then conceded that Skene fails to disclose synchronously receiving a data stream. The Examiner then asserted that it is well known in the art to provide synchronously receiving a data stream as taught by Hepworth. The Examiner asserted that Hepworth discloses an asynchronous communication interface adapter, and also discloses data being transmitted through shift register with start and stop bits. The Examiner further asserted that Hepworth also discloses the data being received and that the start bit synchronizes the timing of the data being received. The Examiner then asserted that this reads on claimed synchronously receiving a data stream, and therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Skene by specifically providing synchronously receiving a data stream, as taught by Hepworth, for the purpose of increased accuracy.

Regarding claim 28, the Examiner asserted that Hepworth teaches synchronous transmittal and Skene discloses communication between a print head and a controller, which reads on claimed print controller adapted to be coupled to the print head and print head configured to transmit a data stream. The Examiner further asserted that Skene discloses setting parity bits, which reads on claimed data pattern, and data that are to be communicated in order to detect possible errors. According to the Examiner, Skene discloses checking the parity bit that was included in the data stream to check whether or not the data has an error, which reads on claimed validating the received data stream when the validating data stream comprises a valid data pattern. In order to validate the transmitted stream, which reads on claimed transmitted and received data stream, based on the parity code, which reads on claimed validating data stream,

that parity code that must be found, which means it has been searched for, according to the Examiner. The Examiner then asserted that Skene discloses the parity code being checked against different odd and even patterns or else the stream would not be valid, which reads on claimed validating data stream.

However, as will be set forth in detail below, it is submitted that the methods and apparatuses, as defined by claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 11-16, 19, 21-24, 28-30 and 32-35 are nonobvious over and patentable distinguishable from Skene in view of Hepworth. Accordingly, this rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

As defined by presently amended claim 11, the present invention is directed to a method of error detection in an inkjet printing apparatus having a printer host coupled to a print head, the method comprising the acts of: synchronously receiving a serial command at the print head from the printer host, the serial command comprising a request for a data stream and a request for a reference data stream at a reference location within the data stream, wherein the reference data stream comprises a bit width of at least two adjacent bits; retrieving the data stream from a print head memory; adding the reference data stream into the data stream at the reference location, thereby forming a first serial data stream; synchronously receiving the first serial data stream at the printer host from the print head; searching for the reference data stream at the reference location within the received first serial data stream; validating the received first serial data stream when the received first serial data stream comprises the reference data stream at the reference location; and acting on the valid or invalid first serial data stream.

As defined by presently amended claim 28, the present invention is directed to an inkjet printing apparatus comprising: a print head configured to insert a reference data stream into a first serial data stream at a reference location, and synchronously transmit the first serial data

stream; and a print controller adapted to be coupled to the print head, and configured to receive the serial data stream from the print head, search for a validating data stream from the transmitted first serial data stream, to validate the received first serial data stream when the validating data stream comprises a valid data stream pattern, and to act on the valid or invalid first serial data stream.

References relied upon to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 must provide an enabling disclosure, i.e., they must place the claimed invention in the possession of the public. *In re Payne*, 203 U.S.P.Q. 245 (CCPA 1979). Furthermore, to establish prima facie obviousness of the claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (CCPA 1974).

Hepworth discloses an asynchronous communication interface adaptor. It is adapted for converting data received on a bidirectional data bus from a parallel word format to a serial word format, and from a serial word format to a parallel word format. The asynchronous communications interface adaptor performs three distinct functions: asynchronous data transmission, asynchronous data reception, and limited modem control (col. 4, lines 55-57).

The deficiencies of Skene are not overcome with the combination of Hepworth. Moreover, Skene alone or in combination with Hepworth, fail to teach or suggest several of the limitations of the presently claimed invention. For example, Skene and Hepworth alone or in combination fail to teach or suggest a method of error detection comprising, *inter alia*, synchronously receiving a serial command at the print head from the printer host, the serial command comprising a request for a data stream and a request for a reference data stream at a reference location within the data stream, adding the reference data stream into the data stream at the reference location, synchronously receiving the first serial data stream at the printer host from

the print head, searching for the reference data stream at the reference location within the received first serial data stream; validating the received first serial data stream when the received first serial data stream comprises the reference data stream at the reference location; and acting on the valid or invalid first serial data stream.

Moreover, Skene and Hepworth, alone or in combination, also fail to teach or suggest an inkjet printing apparatus comprising, *inter alia*, a print head configured to insert a reference data stream into a first serial data stream at a reference location, and synchronously transmit the first serial data stream; and a print controller adapted to be coupled to the print head, and configured to receive the serial data stream from the print head, search for a validating data stream from the transmitted first serial data stream, to validate the received first serial data stream when the validating data stream comprises a valid data stream pattern, and to act on the valid or invalid first serial data stream.

As described above, Skene does not teach, disclose or suggest the use of a synchronously transmitted data stream. Further, Skene does not teach or disclose a data stream comprising a reference pattern having a width of at least two adjacent bits. A parity bit is not a reference pattern. The parity bits of Skene are used to determine if an address line is shorted by ink or corrosion, and not used to check for errors in synchronous serial communication. (col. 7, lines 41-53). Further, neither Skene nor Hepworth teach or suggest inserting a data stream at a reference location.

Hepworth is directed to asynchronous communication systems and methods, and therefore, does not teach or suggest synchronous communication. Synchronous communication, by definition, requires the transmission of a clock signal along with the data signal, while asynchronous communication uses start and stop bits when transmitting and receiving data. The

Applicant respectfully disagrees that using a start bit to start an internal clock reads on synchronously receiving a data stream. The clock utilized in Hepworth is used not for synchronous communication purposes, but to drive an internal clock generator 44 for the purpose of shifting data in parallel to a shift register into serial format (*i.e.*, control the bit rate) (col. 7, lines 23-30). The device of Hepworth does not synchronously receive data, but instead upon receiving a start bit, initiates the internal clock generator with the timing of data. (col. 7, lines 46-50). This is not the same as synchronous communication, which requires data to be synched with an externally generated and transmitted clock. Further, the internal clock of Hepworth is synchronized to the data, the data is not synchronized with a clock ("The clock will be automatically synchronized to the theoretical data midpoint.") (col. 7 lines 57-58).

Moreover, there still must be evidence that "a skilled artisan, confronted with the same problems as the inventor and with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would select the elements from the cited prior art references for combination in the manner claimed." *In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d at 1357, 47 U.S.P.Q.2d at 1456; see also *In re Werner Kotzab*, 217 F.3d 1365, 1371, 55 U.S.P.Q.2D (BNA) 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (" [A] rejection cannot be predicated on the mere identification . . . of individual components of claimed limitations. Rather, particular findings must be made as to the reason the skilled artisan, with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would have selected these components for combination in the manner claimed."). *Id.* The Applicant respectfully argues that there is no motivation to combine Skene with Hepworth, as both references are from different fields of endeavor and not related technology. Skene uses individually addressed conductive traces to form a data word (Fig. 2), which is communicated by the use of individual transistors (Figs. 4A and 4B). Hepworth, on the other hand, discloses a method and apparatus for parallel to serial data conversion. Skene does not teach or disclose a

data stream, and therefore, such an arrangement cannot be serially transmitted as taught by Hepworth. Therefore, such a combination of Skene with Hepworth would create an inoperable device. If references taken in combination would produce a "seemingly inoperative device," then such references teach away from the combination and thus cannot serve as predicates for a prima facie case of obviousness. *In re Spinnoble*, 56 C.C.P.A. 823, 405 F.2d 578, 587, 160 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 237, 244 (CCPA 1969).

It is therefore submitted that the presently claimed methods and apparatuses are nonobvious over and patentable distinguishable from Skene in view of Hepworth. Because claims 2, 3, 5, 6 correspond to patentable claim 1, claims 12-16 and 19 correspond to patentable claim 11, claims 21-24 correspond to patentable claim 20, claims 29, 30 and 32-35 correspond to patentable claim 28, the Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are in a condition for allowance based on the arguments and remarks above. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §103 - Claims 7, 17-18

In the Official Action, claim 7 and 17-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skene in view of Hepworth and further in view of Ono et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,943,911) ("Ono"). However, as will be set forth in detail below, it is submitted that claims 7 and 17-18 are nonobvious over and patentably distinguishable from Skene in view of Hepworth and further in view of Ono. Accordingly, this rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

As indicated above, for a rejection to meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103, prior art references must teach or suggest all of the elements of a the claimed invention.

The deficiencies of Skene are not overcome with the combination of Hepworth and Ono. As discussed herein above, neither Skene, Hepworth, nor Ono, alone or in combination teach or suggest a method of error detection in an inkjet printing apparatus in which, *inter alia*, a first serial data stream is synchronously communicated between a printer host and the print head. Further, neither Skene, Hepworth nor Ono teach or suggest inserting a reference data stream into the data stream, wherein the data stream comprises a bit width of at least two adjacent bits. It is therefore submitted that, because claim 7 corresponds to patentable claim 1, and claims 17-18 correspond to patentable claim 11, the presently claimed methods are nonobvious over and patentably distinguishable from Skene and Hepworth and further in view of Ono, whereby the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 has been overcome. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §103 - Claims 8-9, 26-27, and 36-37

In the Official Action, claims 8-9, 26-27, 36-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skene in view of Ono. However, as will be set forth in detail below, it is submitted that claims 8-9, 26-27 and 36-37 are nonobvious over and patentably distinguishable from Skene in view of Ono. Accordingly, this rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The deficiencies of Skene are not overcome with the combination of Ono. As indicated above, for a rejection to meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103, prior art references must teach or suggest all of the elements of the claimed invention. A synchronous serial data stream is not taught or suggested by Skene or Ono. As discussed herein above, neither Skene nor Ono, alone or in combination teach or suggest a method of error detection in an inkjet printing apparatus in which, *inter alia*, a first serial data stream is synchronously communicated between a printer host

and the print head, as defined by claim 1. Further, neither Skene nor Ono, alone or in combination, teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a clocking control signal generated by a host, wherein a print head communication link is configured to synchronously sequence the first serial data stream at the clocking control signal, and a data stream register is configured to insert a reference data stream into the first serial data stream at a reference location, as defined by claim 20. Similarly, neither Skene nor Ono, alone or in combination, teach or suggest an inkjet printing apparatus comprising, *inter alia*, a print head configured to insert a reference data stream into a first serial stream at a reference location, and synchronously transmit the first serial data stream, as defined by claim 28.

It is therefore submitted that, because claims 8 and 9 correspond to patentable claim 1, claims 26-27 correspond to patentable claim 20, and claims 36-37 correspond to patentable claim 28, the presently claimed methods and systems are nonobvious over and patentably distinguishable from Skene in view of Ono, whereby the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 has been overcome. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) - Claim 25

In the Official Action, claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skene in view of Barbour et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,476,928) (“Barbour”). However, as will be set forth in detail below, it is submitted that claim 25 is nonobvious over and patentably distinguishable over Skene in view of Barbour. Accordingly, this rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The deficiencies of Skene are not overcome with the combination of Barbour. As indicated above, for a rejection to meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103, prior art references

must teach or suggest all of the elements of a the claimed invention. Neither Skene nor Barbour, alone or in combination, teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a clocking control signal generated by a host a print head communication link configured to synchronously sequence the first serial data stream at the clocking control signal, and a data stream register coupled to the print head, and configured to insert a reference data stream into the first serial data stream at a reference location.

It is therefore submitted that, because claim 25 corresponds to patentable claim 20, the presently claimed systems are nonobvious over and patentably distinguishable from Skene in view of Barbour, whereby the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 has been overcome. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §103 - Claims 31, 38-39, 41-42, and 44, 45

In the Official Action, claims 31, 38-39, 41-42, and 44-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skene in view of Hepworth and in further view of Barbour. Regarding claim 38, the Examiner asserted that claim 38 is rejected based on reasoning applied above for claims 1 and 4. The Examiner conceded that Skene fails to disclose inserting a reference data stream into the first data stream after the first data stream has been taken from a memory.

The Examiner then asserted that it was well known in the art to provide inserting a reference data stream into the first data stream after the first data stream has been taken from a memory as taught by Hepworth. According to the Examiner, Hepworth discloses a securitized communication interfaced adapter. The Examiner further asserted that Hepworth discloses that when the data is ready to be transmitted the information in the data register, which reads on

claimed memory, is sent to the transmit shift register and inserted are a start bit and a trailing stop bit or bits and a parity may be included, which reads on claimed inserting a reference data stream into the first data stream after the first data stream has been taken from a memory. According to the Examiner it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Skene by specifically inserting a reference data stream into the first data stream after the first data stream has been taken from a memory for the purpose of enunciating the end of a transmission.

The Examiner further asserted that, in the similar field of endeavor Barbour discloses a system and method for controlling internal operations of a processor of an inkjet print head. According to the Examiner, Barbour discloses a processor and various controllers within a print head that may communicate with a memory in the print head. Therefore, according to the Examiner, it can be seen reasonable for one of ordinary skill in the art for the processor to take readings from the memory rather than directly from the sensor. Barbour also discloses the process of communicating with a main memory in a bidirectional manner, which reads on claimed transmit the data stream to the host, according to the Examiner. Finally, the Examiner asserted that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Skene and Hepworth by specifically providing a print head retrieving a first data stream from a print memory as taught by Barbour for the purposes or processing the data or sending it out to the main controller.

However, as will be set forth in detail below, it is submitted that the apparatuses, as defined by claims 31, 38-39, 41-42, and 44, 45 are nonobvious over and patentable distinguishable from Skene in view of Hepworth in further in view of Barbour. Accordingly, this rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

As defined by presently amended claim 38, the present invention is directed to a print head adapted to be used in a printing apparatus, to be coupled to a host, and to store a first data stream in memory, the print head comprising a data stream module adapted to retrieve the first data stream from the memory, to insert a reference data stream comprising a reference pattern into the first data stream at a reference location thereby forming a transmit data stream, and to synchronously and serially transmit the transmit data stream to the host at a control signal clock frequency, so that the host, upon receiving a data stream, can validate the received data stream if the received data stream comprises the transmit data stream with the inserted reference data stream at the reference location.

Barbour discloses a printing system having a print head assembly with an integrated distributive process for localized control of internal print head processor operations.

The deficiencies of Skene are not overcome with the combination of Hepworth and Barbour. As indicated above, for a rejection to meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103, prior art references must teach or suggest all of the elements of a the claimed invention. Neither Skene, alone or in combination with Hepworth and Barbour, teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a data stream module adapted to insert a reference data stream comprising a reference pattern at a reference location, and to synchronously and serially transmit a transmit data stream, as defined by claim 38. Further, neither Skene, alone or in combination with Hepworth and Barbour, teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a print head configured to insert a reference data stream into a first serial data stream at a reference location, and to synchronously transmit the first serial data stream, as defined by claim 28.

It is therefore submitted that, because claim 31 corresponds to patentable claim 28, and claims 39, 41-42, and 44, 45 correspond to patentable claim 38, the presently claimed

apparatuses are nonobvious over and patentably distinguishable from Skene in view of Hepworth and in further view of Barbour, whereby the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 has been overcome.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §103 - Claims 40 and 43

In the Official Action, claims 40 and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skene in view of Hepworth, in view of Barbour, and in further view of Ono. However, as will be set forth in detail below, it is submitted that claims 40 and 43 are nonobvious over and patentably distinguishable over Skene in view of Hepworth, in view of Barbour, and in further view of Ono. Accordingly, this rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The deficiencies of Skene are not overcome with the combination of Hepworth, Barbour and Ono. As indicated above, for a rejection to meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103, prior art references must teach or suggest all of the elements of a the claimed invention. Neither Skene, alone or in combination with Hepworth, Barbour and Ono, teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a data stream module adapted to insert a reference data stream comprising a reference pattern at a reference location, and to synchronously and serially transmit a transmit data stream, as defined by claim 38.

It is therefore submitted that, because claims 40 and 43 correspond to patentable claim 38, the presently claimed print heads are nonobvious over and patentably distinguishable from Skene in view of Hepworth in view of Barbour and in further view of Ono, whereby the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 has been overcome. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

It is believed that the above represents a complete response to the Examiner's objections and rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103 and places the present application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and an early allowance are requested. Please charge any additional fees required in connection with the present communication, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 04-1133.

Respectfully submitted,

/Geoffrey L. Oberhaus/

Geoffrey L. Oberhaus, Esq.
Reg. No. 42,955
DINSMORE & SHOHL LLP
1900 Chemed Center
255 E. Fifth Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
(513) 977-8623